



REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is responsive to the Office Action dated January 15, 2003. Claims 1-9, 13, 14 and 16-18 were rejected as being anticipated by Walker et al. Claims 1-7 and 9-18 were rejected as being unpatentable over Maruyama in view of Walker et al. Claims 1-9, 13, 14 and 16-18 were also rejected as being anticipated by Kotidis et al. Claims 1-7 and 9-18 were rejected as being unpatentable over the combination of Kotidis et al. in view of Kajiware et al.

The cited references have been thoroughly reviewed, and discussed with the Examiner in a telephone interview on June 9, 2003. Claims 1 and 13, the independent apparatus and method claims, respectively, are being amended. New claims 19-24 are being added. As amended, referring, for example, to the language of claim 1, an aspect of the invention is

“the detector and the optical radiation source being adapted to be located on opposite sides of the oscillating object from each other, with the oscillating object located between the source and the detector so that when so located, the object blocks a portion of the optical radiation directed toward said detector from the source”

This feature is now recited, using appropriate terminology, in each of the independent claims 1 and 13. Additional aspects of this feature are recited in new dependent claims 19-24. With these amendments, claims 1-24 are submitted to be in condition for allowance. Each of the references, as best understood, measures a motion of an object by reflecting light from the object and detecting or measuring the reflected light. The present invention, as now clarified in claims 1 and 13, involves locating an oscillating object so that the object blocks a portion of the optical radiation from an optical radiation source, and then, the magnitude of optical radiation received by a pair of sensors is processed to obtain an indication of the oscillation of the object. In other words, the oscillating object casts a shadow on the first and second optical radiation sensors so that what is detected is partly optical radiation and partly a shadow.

The references, as best understood, neither disclose nor suggest a system for detecting oscillation of an object by placing a detector and an optical radiation source on opposite sides of the object from each other, and so that the object blocks a portion of the optical radiation directed toward the detector from the source, and then processes the received optical radiation to obtain an indication of the oscillation of the object.



The Examiner said that she would give favorable reconsideration to the amended claims, subject to an updated search for additional prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, allowance of claims 1-24 is requested.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on June 9, 2003:

James A. Finder

Name of applicant, assignee or
Registered Representative

Signature

June 9, 2003

Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Finder
Registration No.: 30,173
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

RECEIVED
JUN 13 2003
TC 1700

JAF:db/lac